

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/855,169	WELCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeff H. Aftergut	1733	

All Participants:

(1) Jeff H. Aftergut.

(2) Tim Cassidy.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 May 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
all

Claims discussed:
 30, 42-46

Prior art documents discussed:
all

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed how it was believed that based upon the arguments presented in the appeal brief the claimed invention was allowable over the prior art of record. Noted that there was no specific reason to employ only two chill rollers with the canted spinner. Noted that the non-elected claims needed to be cancelled. Applicant's representative agreed to cancel the non-elected claims so that the application would be passed to issue..